arXiv:math/0511241v1 [math.CV] 9 Nov 2005

RESIDUE CURRENTS OF HOLOMORPHIC MORPHISMS

MATS ANDERSSON

Abstract. Given a generically surjective holomorphic vector bundle morphism $f\colon E \to Q$, E and Q Hermitian bundles, we construct a current R^f with values in $\mathrm{Hom}\,(Q, H)$, where H is a certain derived bundle, and with support on the set Z where f is not surjective. The main property is that if ϕ is a holomorphic section of Q, and $R^f\phi = 0$, then locally $f\psi = \phi$ has a holomorphic solution ψ. In the generic case also the converse holds. This gives a generalization of the corresponding theorem for a complete intersection, due to Dickenstein-Sessa and Passare. We also present results for polynomial mappings, related to M Noether's theorem and the effective Nullstellensatz. The construction of the current is based on a generalization of the Koszul complex. By means of this complex one can also obtain new global estimates of solutions to $f\psi = \phi$, and as an example we give new results related to the H^p-corona problem.

1. Introduction

Let E and Q be holomorphic Hermitian vector bundles of ranks m and r, respectively, over the n-dimensional complex manifold X, and let $f\colon E \to Q$ be a generically surjective holomorphic morphism. Given a holomorphic section ϕ of Q we are interested in holomorphic solutions ψ to $f\psi = \phi$. The basic results in this area are the existence theorems due to Skoda in [21] and [22], which are based on L^2-methods and complex geometry. They provide existence of global holomorphic solutions to the equation $f\psi = \phi$ with L^2-estimates under appropriate geometric conditions provided f is pointwise surjective. However, applying these results to E restricted to $X \setminus Z$, where

$$Z = \{z;\ f(z) \text{ is not surjective}\},$$

also highly non-trivial local results at Z are obtained by these methods.

In this paper we introduce a complex of bundles

$$\cdots \to E_3 \to E_2 \to E \to Q \to 0,$$

Date: February 2, 2008.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 32 A 27, 32 H 02, 32 B 99.

The author was partially supported by the Swedish Natural Science Research Council.

and define a global residue current

$$R^f = R^f_p + \cdots + R^f_\mu$$

with support on Z, $p = \operatorname{codim} Z$ and $\mu = \min(n, m-r+1)$, where R^f_k is a $(0,k)$-current with values in $\operatorname{Hom}(Q, E_k)$. It is not hard to see (e.g., by using Gauss elimination) that $p \le m-r+1$ with equality in the generic case; in this case, thus $R = R_{m-r+1}$. Our first result concerns existence of local holomorphic solutions of $f\psi = \phi$.

Theorem 1.1. *Let E and Q be holomorphic Hermitian vector bundles over a complex manifold X, let $f\colon E \to Q$ be a holomorphic generically surjective morphism, and let R^f be the corresponding residue current. If ϕ is a holomorphic section of Q such that $R^f\phi = 0$, then locally $f\psi = \phi$ has a holomorphic solution ψ.*

We have the following partial converse.

Theorem 1.2. *If $p = m-r+1$ and $f\psi = \phi$ has a holomorphic solution, then $R^f\phi = 0$.*

If $p = m-r+1$ thus $f\psi = \phi$ has holomorphic solutions if and only if $R^f\phi = 0$. If $r = 1$ and $p = m$, it turns out that if $f = \sum f_j e_j$ in a local holomorphic frame e_j, then $R = R_m$ is equal to the classical Coleff-Herrera current

$$T = \Big[\bar\partial\frac{1}{f_1} \wedge \ldots \bar\partial\frac{1}{f_m}\Big]$$

times a non-vanishing section of $(\det E) \otimes Q^*$, see [4]. In this case therefore we get back the Dickenstein-Sessa-Passare theorem, [12] and [19], stating that ϕ belongs to the ideal $(f_1, \ldots, f_m)$ if and only if $\phi T = 0$.

Instead of the usual norm $|\phi|$ of a section ϕ of Q it is natural, e.g., in view of the results in [22], to introduce the stronger pointwise norm

$$\|\phi\|^2 = \det(ff^*)|f^*(ff^*)^{-1}\phi|^2 = \langle \widetilde{ff^*}\phi, \phi\rangle,$$

where $\widetilde{ff^*} = \det(ff^*)(ff^*)^{-1}$ is the smooth endomorphism on Q whose matrix is the transpose of the comatrix of ff^*. By analyzing the singularity of R^f we obtain the following sufficient size condition on ϕ for annihilating the residue.

Proposition 1.3. *Let $f\colon E \to Q$ be a holomorphic generically surjective morphism. If ϕ is a holomorphic section of Q such that*

$$\|\phi\|^2 \le C \det(ff^*)^{\min(n, m-r+1)}, \tag{1.1}$$

then $R^f\phi = 0$.

As an immediate consequence we get the following generalization of the Briançon-Skoda theorem.

Theorem 1.4. *If ϕ is a holomorphic section of Q such that* (1.1) *holds, then locally $f\psi = \phi$ has a holomorphic solution ψ.*

In the case when $r = 1$, (1.1) means precisely that $|\phi| \leq C|f|^{\min(n,m)}$, and the conclusion is then that ϕ is locally in the ideal (f) generated by f (i.e., the ideal generated by f_j if $f = \sum f_j e_j$ in some local holomorphic frame e_j). This immediately implies the classical Briançon-Skoda theorem, [9], which states that $\phi^{\min(m,n)}$ belongs to (f) if $|\phi| \leq C|f|$. For $m - r + 1 \leq n$, Theorem 1.3 also follows directly from Skoda's L^2-estimate, [22], but when $m - r + 1 > n$, the L^2-estimate only gives the conclusion if the power of the right hand side of (1.1) is $n + 1$. By an additional argument in the case when $m > n$, the classical Briançon-Skoda theorem follows from the L^2-estimate; the case when $m > n$ and $r > 1$ can be reduced to the classical result by means of the Fuhrmann trick, see Section 7.

Demailly has extended Skoda's L^2-theorems to $\bar\partial$-closed sections, see [10] and [11]. Our method also admits such an extension of the local result.

Theorem 1.5. *Assume that ϕ is a smooth $\bar\partial$-closed $(0,q)$-section of Q. If $R^f\phi = 0$, then locally $f\psi = \phi$ has $\bar\partial$-closed (current) solutions ψ.*

For degree reasons we see that $R^f\phi = 0$ if $q > n - p$. Thus we get

Corollary 1.6. *If ϕ is any smooth $\bar\partial$-closed $(0,q)$-form with values in Q, and $q > n - p = \dim Z$, then locally $f\psi = \phi$ has $\bar\partial$-closed current solutions.*

In analogy with Theorems 1.3 and (1.4) we also have

Theorem 1.7. *If ϕ is a smooth $\bar\partial$-closed $(0,q)$-form with values in Q such that*

$$\|\phi\|^2 \leq C \det(ff^*)^{\min(n-q,m-1+r)}, \tag{1.2}$$

then $R^f\phi = 0$, and locally there are integrable $\bar\partial$-closed solutions ψ to $f\psi = \phi$.

We can also obtain global results and first we turn our attention to polynomial ideals and generalize the approach in [5]. Let $[z] = [z_0, \dots, z_n]$ be homogeneous coordinates on $\mathbb{P}^n$, and let $z' = (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n)$ be the standard coordinates in the standard affinization $\mathbb{C}^n \simeq \{[z], z_0 \neq 0\}$. Let P be a polynomial mapping $\mathbb{C}^n \to \mathrm{Hom}\,(\mathbb{C}^m, \mathbb{C}^r)$ with columns P^j such that $\deg P^j \leq d_j$, $j = 1, \dots, m$. If f is the matrix whose columns are the d_j-homogenized forms $f^j(z) = z_0^{d_j} P^j(z'/z_0)$ in $\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$, then f defines a morphism

$$f\colon \bigoplus_1^m \mathcal{O}(-d_j) \to \mathbb{C}^r.$$

Let Z be the algebraic variety in $\mathbb{P}^n$ where f is not surjective, and let R^f be the associated residue current with respect to the natural metric.

Theorem 1.8. *Assume that P is a polynomial mapping as above, and let Φ be a r-column of polynomials of degrees $\le \rho$. Moreover, assume that*

$$m \le n+r-1 \quad \text{or} \quad \rho \ge \sum_{j=1}^{n+r} d_j - n, \tag{1.3}$$

where $d_1 \ge d_2 \ge \ldots \ge d_m$. If $R^f\phi = 0$, then there are polynomials Q_j such that $\sum_1^m P^jQ_j = \Phi$, and $\deg P^jQ_j \le \rho$.

Corollary 1.9. *Assume that Z is empty. Then we can find a matrix Q of polynomials with rows Q_k such that $PQ = \sum P^kQ_k = I_r$, and $\deg P^kQ_k \le \sum_{j=1}^{n+r} d_j - n$.*

This is a generalization of a classical theorem of Macaulay, [17].

Corollary 1.10. *Let Φ be a column of polynomials, $\deg\Phi \le \rho$, and let ϕ be its ρ-homogenization. If*

$$\|\phi\|^2 \le C \det(ff^*)^{\min(n,m-r+1)}$$

in $\mathbb{P}^n$, and (1.3) is fulfilled, then $PQ = \Phi$ has a solution with $\deg P^kQ_k \le \rho$.

Assume that P is pointwise surjective in $\mathbb{C}^n$, and let $P^j = (P_1^j, \ldots, P_r^j)^t$. By the local Lojasiewicz inequality there is a constant M such that

$$\sum_{|I|=r}{}' \frac{|\det(P_k^{I_j}(z'))|^2}{(1+|z'|^2)^{\sum_1^r d_{I_j}}} \ge C\frac{1}{(1+|z'|^2)^M}, \tag{1.4}$$

where the sum is over increasing multiindices.

Corollary 1.11. *Assume that $P\colon \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathrm{Hom}\,(\mathbb{C}^m, \mathbb{C}^r)$ is surjective in $\mathbb{C}^n$, $\deg P \le d$ and that (1.4) holds. Then there is a matrix Q of polynomials such that $PQ = I_r$ and $\deg P^jQ_j \le M\min(n, m-r+1)$.*

From Kollar's famous theorem, [16], we can get an estimate of M. For simplicity we assume $d_j = d$ for all j.

Proposition 1.12. *If $d_j = d$ for all j, then the inequality (1.4) holds with*

$$M = (rd)^{\min(n, m!/(m-r)!r!)},$$

provided that $rd \ge 3$.

It should be pointed out that the bound

$$\deg Q + d \le \min(n, m-r+1)M$$

we obtain in this way for a solution to $PQ = I_r$ (even) is not optimal when $r = 1$. It is proved in [16] that one actually have $\deg Q + d \le M$

when $r = 1$. We do not know if it is possible to modify Kollar's proof as to include the case $r > 1$ directly and get a sharper bound.

Now assume that $p = m - r + 1 = n$ and that Z is contained in $\mathbb{C}^n$; thus a discrete set. Moreover, assume that $\Phi = PQ$ is solvable in $\mathbb{C}^n$. Then it follows from Theorem 1.2 that $R^f\phi = 0$ in $\mathbb{C}^n$, and hence $R^f\phi = 0$ in $\mathbb{P}^n$, and since (1.3) is fulfilled we can take $\rho = \deg\Phi$. Therefore there is a solution to $PQ = \Phi$ such that $\deg P^jQ_j \leq \deg\Phi$. When $r = 1$ this is a classical theorem due to Max Noether, [18]. We have the following generalization that appeared in [5] in the case $r = 1$; however we suspect that this case could be proved algebraically, e.g., by the methods in [15].

Theorem 1.13. *Assume that $P\colon \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathrm{Hom}\,(\mathbb{C}^m, \mathbb{C}^r)$ and that $p = m - r + 1$ and that Z has no irreducible component contained in the hyperplane at infinity. Moreover, assume that $\Phi = PQ$ is solvable in $\mathbb{C}^n$. Then there is a solution Q such that $\deg P^jQ_j \leq \deg\Phi$.*

We can also obtain new global results in open bounded domains even when f is pointwise surjective, and as an example we present in Section 7 new sharpened estimates of solutions to the H^p-corona problem in a strictly pseudoconvex domain.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. A generalized Koszul complex 5
3. Surjective morphisms 8
4. Analysis of singularities 10
5. The residue current of a generically surjective holomorphic morphism 13
6. Polynomial mappings 16
7. Estimates for a pointwise surjective morphism 17

References 20

2. A generalized Koszul complex

Let $f\colon E \to Q$ be a holomorphic morphism as above. Assume that we have a complex

$$\cdots \to E_3 \to E_2 \to E \to Q \to 0. \tag{2.1}$$

of vector bundles where all the morphisms, which we denote by δ, are holomorphic. Let $E_0 = Q$, $E_1 = E$, and let

$$H = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{\infty} E_k.$$

We will also consider $(0,*)$-form-valued sections of H, i.e., sections of $T^*_{0,1}(X) \otimes H$. We denote this space of sections by $\mathcal{E}_{0,*}(X, H)$. Notice

that it is a module over the ring (algebra) $\mathcal{E}_{0,*}(X)$. We extend the action of δ to sections of $T^*_{0,1}(X)\otimes H$ by requiring that

$$\delta\xi\otimes w = (-1)^{\deg\xi}\xi\otimes\delta w \tag{2.2}$$

if ξ is a differential form. Then $\delta\bar\partial = -\bar\partial\delta$.

Now suppose that we have $(0,k-1)$-forms, or currents, v_k with values in E_k, $k\geq 1$, such that

$$(\delta-\bar\partial)(v_1+v_2+\cdots) = \phi, \tag{2.3}$$

i.e.,

$$\delta v_{k+1} = \bar\partial v_k,\ k\geq 1, \quad \delta v_1 (= fv_1) = \phi. \tag{2.4}$$

For degree reasons, $\bar\partial v_k = 0$ if k is large enough, and if there are no obstructions for solving $\bar\partial$, we can successively find $(0,k-2)$-forms (currents) w_k with values in E_k such that

$$\bar\partial w_k = v_k + \delta w_{k+1}, \quad k\geq 2. \tag{2.5}$$

Then finally

$$\psi = v_1 + \delta w_2 \tag{2.6}$$

is a holomorphic solution to $f\psi=\phi$. Since the $\bar\partial$-equations always are solvable locally we have

Lemma 2.1. *Suppose that we have a current solution $v = v_1+v_2+\dots$ to* (2.3)*. Then locally there are holomorphic solutions to $f\psi=\phi$.*

If f is surjective, then obviously there are local holomorphic solutions to $f\psi=\phi$ so the interesting case is when f is just generically surjective. In view of the argument in the proof, one also gets a global holomorphic solution provided all the $\bar\partial$-equations have global solutions. Before we proceed with our construction let us consider some examples.

Example 1. If the complex (2.1) is exact (in particular f is surjective), then we can always find such a solution to (2.3). In fact, given a holomorphic section ϕ of Q, let v_1 be any pointwise solution to $\delta v=\phi$. Then $\bar\partial v_1$ is δ-exact and hence there is a v_2 such that $\delta v_2 = \bar\partial v_1$ etc. □

Example 2. If $r=1$, i.e., Q is a line bundle, then one can take $E_k = \Lambda^k E\otimes Q^*$ and δ as interior multiplication with f. One then gets the usual Koszul complex

$$\cdots\to\Lambda^3E\otimes(Q^*)^2\xrightarrow{\delta}\Lambda^2E\otimes Q^*\xrightarrow{\delta}E\xrightarrow{f}Q\to 0, \tag{2.7}$$

which is exact if (and only if) f is non-vanishing. In fact, if we choose any section of $\mathrm{Hom}\,(Q,E)\simeq E\otimes Q^*$ $f\sigma = I_Q$ (if E has a Hermitian metric we can, e.g., choose the section with pointwise minimal norm), then there is an induced mapping $\sigma\colon \Lambda^kE\otimes(Q^*)^{k-1}\to\Lambda^{k+1}E\otimes(Q^*)^k$ such that and $\delta\circ\sigma+\sigma\circ\delta = I$, and thus (2.7) is exact. □

Example 3. Provided that f is surjective, a simple way to find an exact complex (2.1) is by taking $E_2 = \operatorname{Ker} f$ and $E_k = 0$ for $k > 2$. However, E_2 is usually not trivial in a neighborhood of a singular point, i.e., E_2 usually cannot be extended as a vector bundle across the set Z where f is not surjective. To carry out the scheme in the proof of Lemma 2.1, one therefore has to solve a $\bar\partial$-equation in the bundle $E_2 = \operatorname{Ker} f$ over $X \setminus Z$. This is only possible under certain geometric conditions; this is precisely what is investigated and explained in [22]. □

Let us now describe our generalized Koszul complex. Notice that our holomorphic morphism $f\colon E \to Q$ is a holomorphic section of the bundle $\operatorname{Hom}(E, Q)$, which we identify with $E^* \otimes Q$. If ϵ_j is a local holomorphic frame for Q, then

$$f = \sum f_j \otimes \epsilon_j,$$

where f_j are sections of E^*. If η is a section of E, then $f\eta = \sum_1^r \delta_{f_j}\epsilon_j$, where δ_{f_j} denotes interior multiplication with f_j. We can associate to f the section

$$F = f_1 \wedge f_2 \ldots \wedge f_r \otimes \epsilon_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge \epsilon_r$$

of $\Lambda^r E^* \otimes \det Q^*$. It is independent of the particular choice of frame, and will be called the determinant section of f. Notice that f is surjective at a point if and only of F is non-vanishing at that point. There is an induced mapping

$$\delta_F\colon \Lambda^{r+1}E \otimes \det Q^* \to E$$

defined by

$$\delta_F(\xi \otimes \epsilon_1^* \wedge \ldots \wedge \epsilon_r^*) = \delta_{f_r} \cdots \delta_{f_1}\xi,$$

which is also easily seen to be independent of the particular local frame ϵ_j for Q; here ϵ_j^* denotes the dual frame for Q^*. Moreover, it is also clear that

$$f \circ \delta_F = 0. \tag{2.8}$$

In order to proceed with the construction of our complex we have to recall some facts about symmetric tensors. Let $S^\ell Q^*$ be the subbundle of $\bigotimes Q^*$ consisting of symmetric ℓ-tensors of Q^*. If $u, v \in Q^*$ then $u\dot\otimes v = u \otimes v + v \otimes u$, etc. This extends to a commutative mapping $SQ^* \times SQ^* \to SQ^*$. If q is a section of Q, then it induces the usual interior multiplication on $\bigotimes Q^*$ (say from the left), and, in particular, if $u^p = u\dot\otimes \cdots \dot\otimes u$, then $\delta_q u^p = p u^{p-1}(q \cdot u)$.

We now define

$$E_k = \Lambda^{r+k-1}E \otimes S^{k-2}Q^* \otimes \det Q^*, \quad k \geq 2. \tag{2.9}$$

Given the local frame ϵ_j, a section ξ of E_k can be written

$$\xi = \sum_{|\alpha|=k-2} \xi_\alpha \otimes \epsilon_\alpha^* \otimes \epsilon^*,$$

where

$$\epsilon_\alpha^* = \frac{(\epsilon_1^*)^{\alpha_1}\dot\otimes\cdots\dot\otimes(\epsilon_r^*)^{\alpha_r}}{\alpha_1!\cdots\alpha_r!}$$

and $\epsilon^* = \epsilon_1^* \wedge \ldots \wedge \epsilon_r^*$. For $k \geq 2$ we have mappings $\delta\colon E_{k+1} \to E_k$ defined by

$$\xi \otimes q^* \otimes \epsilon^* \mapsto \sum_{j=1}^r \delta_{f_j}\xi \otimes \delta_{\epsilon_j} q^* \otimes \epsilon^*,$$

which are also independent of the specific choice of local frame ϵ_j. Since δ_{f_j} anti-commute and δ_{ϵ_j} commute, it follows that $\delta^2 = 0$. Moreover, if the section ξ of E_2 is in the image of δ, i.e., $\xi = \delta\eta = \sum \delta_{f_j}\eta_j \otimes \epsilon^*$, then clearly $\delta_F\xi = 0$. In view of (2.8) we thus have a complex

$$\cdots \xrightarrow{\delta} E_3 \xrightarrow{\delta} E_2 \xrightarrow{\delta_F} E \xrightarrow{f} Q \to 0. \tag{2.10}$$

In the sequel, we will often denote all the mappings in (2.10) by δ. Observe that if $r = 1$, then (2.10) is just the Koszul complex (2.7).

If we let ξ above take values in $\Lambda(T^*(X)_{0,1} \oplus E)$ rather than just ΛE, then we get an extension of all the mappings δ and δ_F to forms and currents with values in E_k. The mappings $\delta\colon E_{k+1} \to E_k$, $k \geq 2$, will automatically satisfy (2.2) so that $\delta\bar\partial = -\bar\partial\delta$, but we should have to insert the factor $(-1)^{(r+1)q}$ in the definition of δ_F, when it acts on $\xi\otimes w$, and ξ is a $(0,q)$-form. However, we will not do that, and therefore we have instead that $\bar\partial\delta_F = (-1)^r\delta_F\bar\partial$. This means that the final solution ψ in (2.6) is $\psi = v_1 + (-1)^{r+1}\delta w_2$.

3. Surjective morphisms

Now we assume that $f\colon E \to Q$ is surjective and that E and Q are equipped with Hermitian metrics. Moreover, we let E_k be the the derived bundles defined by (2.9). Let σ be the section of $\mathrm{Hom}\,(Q,E) = E\otimes Q^*$ with pointwise minimal norm (i.e., such that $\mathrm{Im}\,\sigma$ is orthogonal to $\mathrm{Ker}\,f$) such that $f\circ\sigma = I_Q$. If ϵ_j^* denotes the dual frame for Q^*, then

$$\sigma = \sum \sigma_j \otimes \epsilon_j^*,$$

where σ_j are the sections of E with minimal norms such that $f_j\cdot\sigma_k = \delta_{jk}$. Moreover,

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma} = \sigma_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge \sigma_r \otimes \epsilon_1^* \wedge \ldots \wedge \epsilon_r^*$$

is a well-defined section of $\Lambda E^r \otimes \det Q^*$, and it induces a mapping $E \to E_2 = \Lambda^{r+1}E \otimes \det Q^*$ defined by

$$\xi \mapsto \boldsymbol{\sigma}\wedge\xi = \sigma_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge \sigma_r \wedge \xi \otimes \epsilon_1^* \wedge \ldots \wedge \epsilon_r^*.$$

Now, $\delta_F\boldsymbol{\sigma}\xi = \xi$ provided that $\delta_{f_j}\xi = 0$ for all j, i.e., ξ is in $\mathrm{Ker}\,f$. Thus (2.10) is exact at E if f is surjective. We also have

Lemma 3.1. *If f is surjective, then* (2.10) *is exact up to E_2.*

Proof. It remains to check the exactness at E_2. Suppose that $\xi\otimes\epsilon^*$ is a section of E_2 such that $0=\delta_F\xi\otimes\epsilon^*$. Thus ξ is a section of $\Lambda^{r+1}E$, such that $\delta_{f_r}\cdots\delta_{f_1}\xi = 0$. By the surjectivity of f, σ_j are linearly independent and therefore they form a part of a basis $\sigma_1,\dots,\sigma_m$ for E. With respect to this basis we can write

$$\xi = \sigma_1\wedge\ldots\wedge\sigma_r\wedge\xi' + \xi'',$$

where ξ'' does not contain all the σ_j, $j=1,\dots,r$. It follows that $\xi'=0$ and hence $\xi=\sum_1^r\xi_j$, where ξ_j does not contain σ_j. Therefore

$$\xi\otimes\epsilon^* = \sum_1^r \delta_{f_j}(\sigma_j\wedge\xi_j)\otimes\epsilon^* = \delta\big(\sum_1^r \sigma_j\wedge\xi_j\otimes\epsilon_j^*\otimes\epsilon^*\big),$$

and thus (2.10) is exact at E_2. □

In order to find a solution to (2.3) it is natural to start with $v_1 = \sigma\phi = \sum\phi_j\sigma_j$, and $v_2 = \boldsymbol{\sigma}\wedge\bar\partial\sigma\phi$. We can just as well suppress ϕ and define u_k with values in $\mathrm{Hom}\,(Q,E_k)$ such that $u_k\phi$ satisfies (2.3). Notice that $\mathrm{Hom}\,(Q,E_1)\simeq E\otimes Q^*$ and

$$\mathrm{Hom}\,(Q,E_k)\simeq\Lambda^{r+k-1}E\otimes S^{k-2}Q^*\otimes\det Q^*\otimes Q^*,\quad k\geq 2.$$

Definition 1. We define the $(0,k-1)$-forms u_k with values in $\mathrm{Hom}\,(Q,E_k)$ as

$$u_1=\sigma,\quad u_k = (\bar\partial\sigma)^{\otimes(k-2)}\otimes\boldsymbol{\sigma}\otimes\bar\partial\sigma,\quad k\geq 2. \tag{3.1}$$

Notice that $(\bar\partial\sigma)^{\otimes(k-2)}$ is indeed a symmetric tensor, and that the definition of u_k is invariant. Moreover,

$$\big(\sum_1^r\bar\partial\sigma_\ell\otimes\epsilon_\ell^*\big)^{\otimes(k-2)} = \frac{(\sum_1^r\bar\partial\sigma_\ell\otimes\epsilon_\ell^*)^{\dot\otimes(k-2)}}{(k-2)!} = \sum_{|\alpha|=k-2}(\bar\partial\sigma)^\alpha\otimes\epsilon_\alpha^*,$$

where

$$(\bar\partial\sigma)^\alpha = (\bar\partial\sigma_1)^{\alpha_1}\wedge\ldots\wedge(\bar\partial\sigma_r)^{\alpha_r}.$$

Since $\bar\partial\sigma_j$ have degree 2 in $\Lambda(T^*_{0,1}(X)\oplus E)$ and therefore commute, we thus have that

$$u_1=\sigma=\sum_j\sigma_j\otimes\epsilon_j^*, \tag{3.2}$$

$$u_k = \sigma_1\wedge\ldots\wedge\sigma_r\wedge\sum_{|\alpha|=k-2}\sum_j(\bar\partial\sigma)^\alpha\wedge\bar\partial\sigma_j\otimes\epsilon_\alpha^*\otimes\epsilon^*\otimes\epsilon_j^*,\quad k\geq 2.$$

Proposition 3.2. *Assume that f is surjective. If u is defined by* (3.1)*, then*

$$(\delta-\bar\partial)(u_1+u_2+\cdots) = I_Q.$$

Here $I_Q\colon Q\to Q$ is the the identity morphism.

Proof. We have already seen that $\delta u_1 = f\sigma = I_Q$ and $\delta_F \boldsymbol{\sigma} \otimes \bar\partial\sigma = \bar\partial\sigma = \bar\partial u_1$, so we have to verify that $\delta u_{k+1} = \bar\partial u_k$ for $k \geq 2$. Now,

$$u_{k+1} = \sigma_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge \sigma_r \wedge \big(\sum_1^r \bar\partial\sigma_\ell \otimes \epsilon_\ell^*\big)^{\otimes(k-1)} \otimes \epsilon^* \otimes \bar\partial\sigma.$$

Recalling that $\delta = \sum \delta_{f_j} \otimes \delta_{\epsilon_j}$, and that δ_{ϵ_j} acts from the left, we get

$$\delta u_{k+1} = \sum_{j=1}^r \delta_{f_j}(\sigma_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge \sigma_r) \wedge \bar\partial\sigma_j \wedge (\sum_1^r \bar\partial\sigma_\ell \otimes \epsilon_\ell^*)^{\otimes(k-2)} \otimes \epsilon^* \otimes \bar\partial\sigma.$$

On the other hand,

$$\bar\partial u_k = \bar\partial(\sigma_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge \sigma_r) \wedge (\sum_1^r \bar\partial\sigma_\ell \otimes \epsilon_\ell^*)^{\otimes(k-2)} \otimes \epsilon^* \otimes \bar\partial\sigma.$$

It is now clear that $\delta u_{k+1} = \bar\partial u_k$. □

It follows that if $\phi = \sum \phi_j \epsilon_j$ is a holomorphic section of Q and $v_k = u_k\phi$, then $v = u\phi$ satisfies (2.3). For later purpose we rewrite the expression for $u\phi$ so that it only "depends" on $\sigma\phi = \sum_j \phi_j\sigma_j$. In fact, applying $\bar\partial$ to the equality $0 = \boldsymbol{\sigma}\otimes\sigma$ we get $0 = \boldsymbol{\sigma}\otimes\bar\partial\sigma + (-1)^r\bar\partial\boldsymbol{\sigma}\otimes\sigma$. Therefore,

$$u_k\phi = (-1)^{r+1}(\bar\partial\sigma)^{\otimes(k-2)} \otimes \bar\partial\boldsymbol{\sigma} \otimes \sigma\phi, \quad k \geq 2, \tag{3.3}$$

or more explicitly (the possible minus sign cancels out)

$$u_k\phi = (\sum_j \phi_j\sigma_j) \wedge \bar\partial(\sigma_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge \sigma_r) \wedge \sum_{|\alpha|=k-2} (\bar\partial\sigma)^\alpha \otimes \epsilon_\alpha^* \otimes \epsilon^* =$$

$$(\sum_j \phi_j\sigma_j) \wedge \bar\partial(\sigma_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge \sigma_r) \wedge (\sum_1^r \bar\partial\sigma_\ell \otimes \epsilon_\ell^*)^{\otimes(k-2)} \otimes \epsilon^*, \quad k \geq 2.$$

4. Analysis of singularities

We now consider an f that is not necessarily surjective everywhere. Then we can define u as above in $X \setminus Z$, where Z is the set where f is not surjective, which is equal to the zero set of the holomorphic section F and hence an analytic subvariety of X. To analyze the singularities of u at Z we will use the following lemma.

Lemma 4.1. *(i) Let s be the section of* $\mathrm{Hom}\,(Q,E) \simeq E\otimes Q^*$ *with pointwise minimal norm such that*

$$fs = |F|^2 I_Q,$$

and let S be the section of $\Lambda^r E \otimes \det Q^*$ with pointwise minimal norm such that

$$FS = 1.$$

Then s and S are smooth across Z, and

$$s = |F|^2\sigma, \quad S = |F|^2\boldsymbol{\sigma} \quad \text{in } X \setminus Z.$$

(ii) If in addition $F = F_0F'$ for some holomorphic function F_0 and non-vanishing holomorphic section F', then

$$s' = F_0\sigma, \quad S' = F_0\boldsymbol{\sigma}$$

are smooth across Z.

Given a section η of E^*, let η^* denote the dual section with respect to the Hermitian metric, i.e., $\langle \xi, \eta^* \rangle = \eta \cdot \xi$ for sections ξ of E. The mapping $\eta \mapsto \eta^*$ is conjugate-linear and extends to a conjugate-linear mapping $\Lambda E^* \to \Lambda E$ by

$$\eta_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge \eta_r \mapsto \eta_1^* \wedge \ldots \wedge \eta_r^*.$$

Proof. Assume that ϵ_j is a local frame for Q as before, let ϵ_j^* be its dual frame, and assume $f = \sum f_j \otimes \epsilon_j$. Now,

$$S = |\epsilon_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge \epsilon_r|^2 f_1^* \wedge \ldots \wedge f_r^* \otimes \epsilon_1^* \wedge \ldots \wedge \epsilon_r^*$$

is a section of $\Lambda^r E \otimes \det Q^*$ that is independent of the particular choice of frame. This is checked by considering a change of frame $\epsilon' = \epsilon g$, where g is an invertible $r \times r$-matrix. Notice that

$$FS = |\epsilon_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge \epsilon_r|^2 |f_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge f_r|^2 = |F|^2. \tag{4.1}$$

We can choose the frame ϵ_j such that f_j are orthogonal at any given point outside Z. Thus $f_j = \alpha_j e_j^*$, $j = 1, \ldots, r$ for some ON-frame e_j^* of E^* and $f_j^* = \bar{\alpha}_j e_j$, and it is then easy to see that S is in fact the section with minimal norm such that $FS = 1$. In particular this means that S is the dual section of F. Moreover, at this point, $\sigma_j = (1/\alpha_j)e_j$, $j = 1, \ldots, r$, and thus

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma} = \frac{e_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge e_r}{\alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_r} \otimes \epsilon_1^* \wedge \ldots \wedge \epsilon_r^*.$$

Therefore,

$$|F|^2\boldsymbol{\sigma} = |\epsilon_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge \epsilon_r|^2 \bar{\alpha}_1 \cdots \bar{\alpha}_r e_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge e_r \otimes \epsilon_1^* \wedge \ldots \wedge \epsilon_r^* = S.$$

Now assume that $F = F_0F'$. Since S is the dual section of F it follows that $S = \bar{F}_0 S''$, where S'' is the dual section of F', and thus S'' is smooth even across Z. Therefore $F_0\boldsymbol{\sigma} = F_0 S/|F|^2 = S''/|F'|^2$ is smooth across Z as well.

Now, define

$$s = \big(\sum_1^r \delta_{f_j} \otimes \delta_{\epsilon_j}\big)^{r-1} S/r! =$$

$$|\epsilon_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge \epsilon_r|^2 \sum_1^r (-1)^{\ell+1} \delta_{f_r} \cdots \delta_{f_{\ell+1}} \delta_{f_{\ell-1}} \cdots \delta_{f_1} (f_1^* \wedge \ldots \wedge f_r^*) \otimes \epsilon_j^*.$$

Clearly,

$$fs = \sum_1^r \delta_{f_j} \otimes \epsilon_j s = |\epsilon_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge \epsilon_r|^2 |f_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge f_r|^2 \sum_j \epsilon_j \otimes \epsilon_j^* = |F|^2 I_Q.$$

Moreover, it is readily checked that s is orthogonal to $\operatorname{Ker} f$ so that s is the minimal section such that $fs = |F|^2 I_Q$. One can also check this by choosing a frame as above such that that f_j are orthogonal. Thus, $s/|f|^2 = \sigma$. Finally, if $F_0\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ is smooth across Z it follows that

$$F_0\sigma = \big(\sum_1^r \delta_{f_j} \otimes \delta_{\epsilon_j}\big)^{r-1} F_0\boldsymbol{\sigma}$$

is smooth as well. □

Remark 1. Assume that Q as well as E are trivial and equipped with the trivial metrics, and e_j and ϵ_j are ON-frames. If

$$F = \sum_{|I|=r}{}' F_I \otimes e_I^*,$$

(suppressing the factor $\epsilon_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge \epsilon_r$ and its dual), we have that

$$S = \sum_{|I|=r}{}' \overline{F_I} \otimes e_I.$$

□

Since $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \otimes \sigma = 0$ we have, for any scalar function ξ, that

$$(4.2)\quad (\bar\partial(\xi\sigma))^{\otimes(k-2)} \otimes \xi\boldsymbol{\sigma} \otimes \bar\partial(\xi\sigma) = (-1)^{r+1}(\bar\partial(\xi\sigma))^{\otimes(k-2)} \otimes \bar\partial(\xi\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \otimes \xi\sigma = \xi^k u_k.$$

In view of Lemma 4.1 we have in particular that

$$(4.3)\quad u_1 = \frac{s}{|F|^2},$$

$$u_k = \frac{(\bar\partial s)^{\otimes(k-2)} \otimes\ S \otimes \bar\partial s}{|F|^{2k}} = (-1)^{r+1}\frac{(\bar\partial s)^{\otimes(k-2)} \otimes\ \bar\partial S \otimes s}{|F|^{2k}}, \quad k \ge 2$$

Lemma 4.2. *If $f^*\colon Q \to E$ is the adjoint morphism with respect to the Hermitian structures on Q and E, then*

$$(4.4)\qquad |F|^2 = \det(ff^*).$$

Proof. Since both sides of (4.4) are invariant pointwise statements, we can assume that ϵ_j is a ON-frame. Let ξ be any section of E. Then

$$f_\ell \cdot \xi = \langle \sum_j (f_j \cdot \xi)\epsilon_j, \epsilon_\ell\rangle = \langle f\xi, \epsilon_\ell\rangle = \langle \xi, f^*\epsilon_\ell\rangle$$

which means that $f^* = \sum_j f_j^* \otimes \epsilon_j^*$. It follows that

$$ff^* = \sum (f_j \cdot f_k^*)\epsilon_j \otimes \epsilon_k^* = \langle f_j, f_k\rangle \epsilon_j \otimes \epsilon_k^*.$$

Thus

$$\det(ff^*) = \det\langle f_j, f_k\rangle = |f_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge f_r|^2,$$

which implies the statement since $|\epsilon_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge \epsilon_r| = 1$, cf., (4.1). □

Since $(ff^*)^{-1} = \widetilde{ff^*}/\det(ff^*)$ and $s/|F|^2 = \sigma = f^*(ff^*)^{-1}$ we can conclude that

$$s = f^*\widetilde{ff^*}.$$

Moreover, if $F = F_0F'$ as in Lemma 4.1 above, then by (4.4),

$$|s'\phi| = |\sigma\phi||F_0| = |f^*(ff^*)^{-1}\phi||F|/|F'| = \|\phi\|/|F'|. \tag{4.5}$$

5. The residue current of a generically surjective holomorphic morphism

We say that $f\colon E \to Q$ is generically surjective if Z has positive codimension. Again let E_k be the derived bundles defined by (2.9) and let $H = Q \oplus E \oplus E_2 \oplus E_3 \oplus \cdots$. From Section 3 we have we the section u of $\mathrm{Hom}\,(Q, H)$ over $X \setminus Z$ defined by (3.2). Following [4] we shall now extend it to a current U with values in $\mathrm{Hom}\,(Q, H)$ across Z and define the corresponding residue current.

Theorem 5.1. *Assume that $f\colon E \to Q$ is a generically surjective holomorphic morphism and let u be the associated section of* $\mathrm{Hom}\,(Q, H)$ *defined in $X \setminus Z$. The function $\lambda \mapsto |F|^{2\lambda}u$ is holomorphic for* $\mathrm{Re}\,\lambda > -\epsilon$ *and*

$$U = |F|^{2\lambda}u|_{\lambda=0}$$

is a current extension of u across Z. Moreover,

$$(\delta - \bar\partial)U = I_Q - R^f,$$

where

$$R^f = \bar\partial|F|^{2\lambda} \wedge u|_{\lambda=0}.$$

The current R^f (taking values in $\mathrm{Hom}\,(Q, H)$*) has support on Z and*

$$R^f = R^f_p + \cdots + R^f_\mu,$$

where $p = \mathrm{codim}\, Z$ and $\mu = \min(n, m - r + 1)$, and R^f_k is a current of bidegree $(0, k)$ with values in E_k.

Proof. The proof is more or less identical to the proof of Theorem 1.1 in [4], so we only sketch it. After an appropriate resolution of singularities we may assume that $F = F_0F'$, where F_0 is a holomorphic function and F' is a non-vanishing section of (the pullback of) $\Lambda^r E^* \otimes \det Q$.

According to Lemma 4.1 (ii), then $s' = F_0\sigma$ and $S' = F_0\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ are smooth across the singularity, and hence by (4.2),

$$u_1 = \frac{s'}{F_0}, \quad u_k = (-1)^{r+1}\frac{(\bar\partial s')^{\otimes(k-2)}\otimes\bar\partial S'\otimes s'}{F_0^k}, \quad k\geq 2.$$

It is now easy to see that the analytic continuations of $|F|^{2\lambda}u_k$ exist, and in this resolution the values at $\lambda = 0$ are just the principal value currents

$$u_1 = \Big[\frac{1}{F_0}\Big]s', \quad \Big[\frac{1}{F_0^k}\Big](\bar\partial s')^{\otimes(k-2)}\otimes\bar\partial S'\otimes s'.$$

Precisely as in [4], by the way following [7] and [20], one can show that

$$R_k^f = \bar\partial|F|^{2\lambda}\wedge u_k\big|_{\lambda=0} = 0$$

if $k < p = \operatorname{codim} Z$. Thus Theorem 5.1 is proved. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2. If

$$\phi = f\psi = \sum_1^r(\delta_{f_j}\psi)\epsilon_j,$$

then

$$u_{m-r+1}\phi = (\sum_1^r\phi_j\bar\partial\sigma_j)\wedge\sigma_1\wedge\ldots\wedge\sigma_r\wedge(\bar\partial\sigma)^{\otimes(m-r-1)}\otimes\epsilon^* =$$

$$(\sum_{j=1}^r\delta_{f_j}\psi\wedge\bar\partial\sigma_j)\wedge\sigma_1\wedge\ldots\wedge\sigma_r\wedge(\bar\partial\sigma)^{\otimes(m-r-1)}\otimes\epsilon^* =$$

$$\psi\wedge\sum_{j=1}^r\delta_{f_j}\big(\sigma_1\wedge\ldots\wedge\sigma_r\big)\wedge\bar\partial\sigma_j\wedge(\bar\partial\sigma)^{\otimes(m-r-1)}\otimes\epsilon^* =$$

$$\bar\partial\Big(\psi\wedge\sigma_1\wedge\ldots\wedge\sigma_r\wedge(\bar\partial\sigma)^{\otimes(m-r-1)}\otimes\epsilon^*\Big) = \bar\partial(u'\psi),$$

where we have used that the form has maximal degree m in ΛE. If we define

$$R'\psi = \bar\partial|f|^{2\lambda}\wedge u'\wedge\psi|_{\lambda=0},$$

it follows that

$$R_{m-r+1}\phi = \bar\partial(R'\psi).$$

However, since $\operatorname{codim} Z = m-r+1$ it follows as in the proof of Theorem 5.1 above that $R'\psi$, being a $(0,m-r)$-current, vanishes for degree reasons. Thus the theorem is proved. □

Proof of Proposition 1.3. Let ξ by a test form with support contained in neighborhood where we have the resolution of singularities. In view of (4.2) we see that $R_k^f\cdot\xi$ is a sum of terms like

$$\bar\partial|F_0|^{2\lambda}v^\lambda\wedge\frac{(\bar\partial s')^{\otimes(k-2)}\otimes\bar\partial S'\otimes s'\phi}{F_0^k}\rho\Big|_{\lambda=0},$$

where ρ is a cut-off function, and v is a smooth strictly positive function. By the hypothesis, (4.5), and (4.2),

$$|s'\phi| \sim \|\phi\| \lesssim |F|^{\min(n,m-r+1)} \lesssim |F_0|^k,$$

since $k \leq \min(n, m-r+1)$. Thus we must check that

$$\int \bar\partial |F_0|^{2\lambda} v^\lambda \wedge \frac{\eta}{F_0^\ell}$$

vanishes at $\lambda = 0$ if v is a test form that is $\mathcal{O}(|F_0|^\ell)$. However, we may as well assume that F_0 is a monomial in the local coordinates, and therefore this statement follows from the corresponding one-variable statement; that

$$\int_\tau \bar\partial |\tau|^{2\lambda} v^\lambda \wedge \frac{\eta(\tau) d\tau}{\tau^\ell}$$

vanishes at $\lambda = 0$ if $\eta = \mathcal{O}(|\tau|^\ell)$. If we write

$$\bar\partial |\tau|^{2\lambda} = \lambda |\tau|^{2\lambda} \frac{d\bar\tau}{\bar\tau}$$

this follows by dominated convergence. □

Proofs of Theorems 1.5 and 1.7. These theorems are proved in much the same way as the corresponding results for holomorphic functions. In fact, if ϕ is a $\bar\partial$-closed smooth form with values in Q, then $(\delta - \bar\partial)U\phi = \phi - R^f\phi$ so $(\delta - \bar\partial)U\phi = \phi$ if $R^f\phi = 0$. Following an apparent modification of the procedure in (2.5) we get a $\bar\partial$-closed current ψ with values in E such that $f\psi = \phi$. However, if (1.2) holds, then it is not hard to verify that $U\phi$ is locally integrable; in fact in a resolution as above $U\phi$ is then bounded, in particular it is locally integrable, and therefore $U\phi$ is locally integrable in X. Therefore, we can get a locally integrable solution ψ. □

For further reference we state the following proposition that shows that the principal term R^f_p of the current R^f (where $p = \operatorname{codim} Z$) is robust in certain sense. It is proved precisely as Theorem 2.1 in [5].

Proposition 5.2. *Let f be a generically surjective morphism, let R^f be the associated residue current, and let $p = \operatorname{codim} Z$. Assume that h is a holomorphic section of some line bundle such that $\{h = 0\} \cap Z$ has codimension $p+1$. If ϕ is a holomorphic section such that $R^f_p \phi = 0$ in $X \setminus \{h = 0\}$, then $R^f_p \phi = 0$ in X.*

6. Polynomial mappings

Let $L^s = \mathcal{O}(s)$ be the line bundle over $\mathbb{P}^n$ whose sections are represented by s-homogenoues functions in $z = (z_0, \dots, z_n)$. If ϕ is a section of L^s its natural norm is

$$\|\phi(z)\| = \frac{|\phi(z)|}{|z|^s}.$$

Let E_j, $j = 1, \dots, m$, be trivial line bundles over $\mathbb{P}^n$ with basis elements e_j. If f^j are the d_j-homogenizations of the columns of polynomials P^j as in Theorem 1.8, then $f_k = \sum_1^m f_k^j e_j^*$ are sections of

$$E^* = E_1^* \otimes L^{d_1} \oplus \cdots \oplus E_m^* \otimes L^{d_m}.$$

Observe that the section $F = f_1 \dots \wedge f_r$ of $\Lambda^r E^*$ can be written

$$F = \sum_{|I|=r}{}' F_I e_{I_1}^* \wedge \dots \wedge e_{I_r}^*,$$

where $F_I = \det(f_k^{I_j})$. Thus

$$\|F(z)\|^2 = \frac{\sum'_{|I|=r} |F_I(z)|^2}{|z|^{2\sum_1^r d_{I_j}}}.$$

If we write this expression in the affine coordinates z' we get precisely the left hand side of (1.4). Let Q be the trivial bundle $\mathbb{C}^r \to \mathbb{P}^n$. Then f defines a morphism $f\colon E \to Q$ such that

$$\psi = (\psi_1, \dots, \psi_m) \mapsto \sum_1^m f^j \psi_j$$

where f^j are the homogenizations of the given (columns) of polynomials P_j of degrees d_j. We can now prove Theorem 1.8.

Proof of Theorem 1.8. Let

$$\cdots \to E_2 \to E \to \mathbb{C}^r \to 0.$$

be the induced complex defined in Section 2. We can take tensor products with L^ρ and get the complex

$$\cdots \to E_2 \otimes L^\rho \to E \otimes L^\rho \to \mathbb{C}^r \otimes L^\rho \to 0.$$

Let U and R^f be the corresponding currents from Section 5 with respect to the natural Hermitian metrics of E and Q. If ϕ is a section of $Q \otimes L^\rho$, and $R^f \phi = 0$, then $v = U\phi$ solves the equations

$$(\delta - \bar\partial)(v_1 + v_2 + \cdots + v_{\min(n+1, m-r+1)}) = \phi.$$

In order to get a holomorphic solution ψ to $f\psi = \phi$ we have to solve all the equations $\bar\partial w_k = v_k - \delta v_{k+1}$. Notice that $v_k - \delta v_{k+1}$ is a $(0, k-1)$-current with values in $E_k \otimes L^\rho$. It is well-known that $H^{0,k}(\mathbb{P}^n, L^\nu) = 0$ for all ν if $1 \le k \le n-1$, whereas $H^{0,n}(\mathbb{P}^n, L^\nu) = 0$ (if and only) if $\nu \ge -n$. If $m - r + 1 \le n$ there is therefore no problems at all, and

the only possible obstruction may appear when $k = n+1$. Notice that v_{n+1} takes values in

$$E_{n+1} \otimes L^\rho = \Lambda^{r+n} E \otimes S^{n-1} Q^* \otimes Q^* \otimes L^\rho.$$

Since Q is trivial, E_{n+1} is a direct sum of line bundles

$$L^{\rho - (d_{I_1} + \ldots + d_{I_{r+n}})},$$

where I is an increasing multiindex. Therefore the crucial $\bar\partial$-equation is solvable if $\rho - (d_1 + \cdots + d_{n+r}) \geq -n$. Finally we express the relation $\sum f^j \psi_j = f\psi = \phi$ in affine coordinates and get the desired polynomials Q_j as $Q_j(z') = \psi_j(1, z')$. □

Proof of Proposition 1.12. If we have m' polynomials P'_ν of degrees at most d' with no common zeros in $\mathbb{C}^n$, then it is proved in [16] that

$$\frac{|P_\nu(z')|^2}{(1+|z'|^2)^{d'}} \geq C \frac{1}{(1+|z'|^2)^M},$$

where $M = (d')^{\min(n,m')}$, provided that $d' \geq 3$. We have $m!/(m-r)!r!$ polynomials $P_I = \det(P^k_{I_j})$ of degrees $d' = rd$ and hence the proposition follows. □

Proof of Theorem 1.13. Since $\phi = f\psi$ is solvable in $\mathbb{C}^n$ and $p = m - r + 1$, $R^f\phi = 0$ in $\mathbb{C}^n$ by Theorem 1.2. If we take the section $h = z_0$ of $\mathcal{O}(1)$, then since assumption Z has no irreducible component in the plane at infinity, $\operatorname{codim} Z \cap \{z_0 = 0\} = m - r + 2$. By Proposition 5.2 we therefore have that $R^f\phi = 0$ in $\mathbb{P}^n$. Since (1.3) is fulfilled, the desired solution is given by Theorem 1.8. □

7. Estimates for a pointwise surjective morphism

In this section we indicate that our method can be used to get new quite sharp estimates even when f is pointwise surjective. Let us assume that $E \simeq \mathbb{C}^m$ and $Q \simeq \mathbb{C}^r$ are trivial bundles over a smoothly bounded domain $D = \{\rho < 0\}$ in $\mathbb{C}^n$, and equipped with the trivial metrics. Then a morphism $f\colon E \to Q$ is just a matrix of holomorphic functions in D. We assume that $f \in H^\infty(D, \operatorname{Hom}(E, Q))$, and that moreover

$$|f_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge f_r| \geq \delta > 0;$$

this means that f is uniformly surjective. Notice that since Q is trivial, $\det Q^*$ is just the trivial line bundle, so $F = f_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge f_r$. Let

$$\|\phi\|^p_{H^p} = \sup_{\epsilon > 0} \int_{\rho = -\epsilon} |\phi(z)|^p dS, \quad 0 < p < \infty.$$

It was proved in [2] and [3] that if D admits a plursubharmonic defining function ρ, and $p \leq 2$, then for any $\phi \in H^p(D, Q)$ there is a $\psi \in H^p(E)$ such that $f\psi = \phi$. Morerover, the norm of ϕ is bounded by a constant times $\log(1/\delta)/\delta^{1+\mu}$, where $\mu = \min(n, m-r)$. To be precise, this sharp estimate is only explicitly given in the case $r = 1$, but it follows

(hopefully) in the general case as well with a similar argument. This result is proved by a combination of the L^2-methods in [22], the refined L^2 estimate for $\bar\partial_b$ introduced in [8], and Wolff type estimates.

The case $p > 2$ and $r = 1$ has been studied by several authors in strictly pseudoconvex domains, e.g., [1] and [6], and a generalization to $r > 1$ is made in [14]. These works are based on integral representation and harmonic analysis. There are also similar results for other spaces of functions, see, e.g., the references in [6]. To show how the ideas in this paper can be applied in a situation like this we present the new result Theorem 7.1 below. It is clear that other known results that are proved by means of the Koszul complex in the case $r = 1$ can be generalized to the case $r > 1$ in an analogous way.

Theorem 7.1. *Let D be a strictly pseudoconvex domain with reasonably smooth (C^3 is enough) boundary and $p < \infty$. For any $\phi \in H^p(D, Q)$ there is a $\psi \in H^p(D, E)$ such that $f\psi = \phi$ and*

$$\|\psi\|_{H^p} \le C_\delta \|\phi\|_{H^p}, \tag{7.1}$$

where

$$C_\delta \le C(\log(1/\delta))^{\mu/2}/\delta^{1+\mu}, \quad \text{if} \quad \mu = \min(n, m-r) > 1$$

and

$$C_\delta \le C\log(1/\delta)/\delta^2 \quad \text{if} \quad \min(n, m-r) = 1.$$

and $C_\delta = 1/\delta$ if $\min(n, m-r) = 0$, i.e., $m = r$, and C is a constant that is independent of m.

In the case $r = 1$ this coincides with the result in [6]. Since the proof of this generalization follows the proof in [6] quite closely we just give a sketch and indicate the necessary modifications.

Sketch of proof. With the notation as before we have that $v = u\phi$, where $u = u_1 + \cdots u_{1+\mu}$ and

$$u_{k+1} = (\bar\partial\sigma)^{\otimes(k-1)} \otimes \boldsymbol{\sigma} \otimes \bar\partial\sigma.$$

Since Q is trivial and ϵ_j is a ON-frame we have, cf., Remark 1, that $S = \sum' \overline{F_I} e_I \otimes \epsilon^*$ of $F = \sum' F_I e_I^* \otimes \epsilon$, so the coefficients in S are anti-holomorphic. Moreover, $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = S/|F|^2$ and

$$\sigma = (\sum \delta_{f_j} \otimes \delta_{\epsilon_j})\boldsymbol{\sigma}/k!$$

so that

$$\bar\partial\sigma = \pm(\sum \delta_{f_j} \otimes \delta_{\epsilon_j})\bar\partial\boldsymbol{\sigma}/k!.$$

The norm of forms will be taken with respect to the non-isotropic metric $\Omega = -\rho i\partial\bar\partial\log(1/-\rho))$; we assume that ρ is a strictly plurisubharmonic defining function. For $k \ge 2$ we can estimate the Carleson norm of $(-\rho)^{\frac{k-2}{2}}|u_{k+1}|$ precisely as in the proof of Proposition 5.2 in [6], with F instead of g and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ instead of γ, and obtain the same estimate $C\delta^{-k-1}(\log(1/\delta))^{k/2}$.

The necessary estimate of u_2 is of Wolff type and involves Łu_2 where Ł is a smooth $(1,0)$-vector field. More precisely we need to know that the Carleson norm of $|u_2|^2$ is bounded by C^2 and the Carleson norm of $\sqrt{-\rho}|$Ł$u_2|$ is bounded by C, where $C = \delta^{-2}\log(1/\delta)$. It is easily seen that

$$|u_2| \lesssim \frac{|\partial F|}{|F|^3} \leq \frac{1}{\delta}\frac{|\partial F|}{|F|^2},$$

and the desired Carleson estimate of $|u_2|^2$ now follows form Proposition 5.2 in [6]. For any holomorphic function ψ we have that $\sqrt{-\rho}|$Ł$\psi| \lesssim ||partial\psi|$. When we compute Ł$u_2$ we get either derivatives on the factor $1/|F|^2$ or on the functions f_j in $(\sum \delta_{f_j}\otimes\delta_{\epsilon_j})^{r-1}$. Therefore we have that

$$\sqrt{-\rho}|\text{Ł}u_2| \lesssim \frac{\partial h||\partial F|}{|F|^3} + \frac{|\partial F|^2}{|F|^4} \lesssim \frac{1}{\delta^2} + \frac{|\partial F|^2}{|F|^4},$$

where h is a holomorphic and bounded. It now follows from Proposition 5.2 in [6] that the Carleson norm is $\lesssim \delta^{-2}\log(1/\delta)$ as wanted. □

Remark 2. If we just assume that ϕ is in H^p with respect to the stronger pointwise norm $\|\phi\|$ instead of $|\phi|$, the same proof would give a solution in H^p provided that we could say that the maximal function of $\|\phi\|$ is in $L^p(\partial D)$. However, we do not know if this is true. □

As mentioned above, a similar result has previously been obtained by Hergoualch, [14], using an idea of Fuhrmann, [13], to reduce to the case $r = 1$. However, by this method one has some loss of precision in the dependence of δ. To see this let us describe this method. Assume that $\phi = \sum \phi_j\epsilon_j$ is in $H^p(D,Q)$. Now $F = f_1\wedge\ldots\wedge f_r \in H^\infty(D,\Lambda^r E^*)$ and $|F| \geq \delta$, so by the corresponding result for $r = 1$, for each ϕ_j we can find a section H^j of $H^p(D,\Lambda^r E)$ such that $F\cdot H^j = \phi_j$, $j = 1,\ldots,r$, with $\|H^j\|_{H^p} \leq C'_\delta\|\phi\|_{H^p}$. Since the rank of $\Lambda^r E^*$ is $m!/(m-r)!r!$, we get

$$C'_\delta \leq C\frac{(\log(1/\delta))^{\mu'/2}}{\delta^{1+\mu'}}, \quad \mu' = \min(n, m!/(m-r)!r!),$$

if $\mu' > 1$. Since $f_1\wedge\ldots\wedge f_r\cdot H^j = \phi_j$, we also have that $f_j\cdot\psi_j = \phi_j$ if

$$\psi_j = (-1)^{j+1}\delta_{f_r}\cdots\delta_{f_{j+1}}\delta_{f_{j-1}}\cdots\delta_{f_1}H^j.$$

Now $\psi = \psi_1 + \cdots + \psi_r$ solves $f_j\psi = \phi_j$ for each j, i.e., $f\psi = \phi$ as wanted, and since f_j are bounded, we get the same estimate

$$\|\psi\|_{H^p} \leq C'_\delta\|\phi\|_{H^p}.$$

However, $\mu' > \mu$ as soon as $m - r < n$ as in this case it is strictly weaker than (7.1).

Remark 3. It is actually possible to solve the equation $F\Psi = \phi$ above with a sharper estimate, by means of the complex

$$\to \Lambda^{r+2}E \otimes S^2Q^* \otimes \det Q^* \to$$
$$\Lambda^{r+1}E \otimes Q^* \otimes \det Q^* \to \Lambda^r E \otimes \det Q^* \to \mathbb{C} \to 0$$

with the same mappings as before. Combined with the Fuhrmann trick one can then obtain Theorem 7.1. This complex, and the corresponding residues that appear when f is only generically surjective, will be studied in a forthcoming paper. □

References

[1] E. Amar: *On the corona problem*, J. of Geom. Anal. **1** (1991).

[2] M. Andersson: *The H^p corona problem in weakly pseudoconvex domains*, Trans. AMS **342** (1994), 241–155, *The H^2-corona theorem* Preprint Göteborg (1990).

[3] M. Andersson: *On the H^p-corona problem*, Bull. Sci. Math., **118** (1994), 287–306.

[4] M. Andersson: *Residue currents and ideals of holomorphic functions*, Bull. Sci. Math., **128**, (2004), 481–512.

[5] M. Andersson: *The membership problem for polynomial ideals in terms of residue currents*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (to appear).

[6] M. Andersson & H. Carlsson: *Estimates of solutions of the H^p and $BMOA$ corona problem*, Math. Ann. **316**, (2000), 83–102.

[7] C. Berenstein & A. Yger: *Green currents and analytic continuation*, J. Anal. Math. **75** (1998), 1–50.

[8] B. Berndtsson: *$\overline{\partial}_b$ and Carleson type inequalities*, Complex analysis, II (College Park, Md., 1985–86), 42–54, Lecture Notes in Math., 1276, Springer, Berlin, 1987.

[9] J. Briançon & H. Skoda: *Sur la clôture intégrale d'un idéal de germes de fonctions holomorphes en un point de $\mathbb{C}^n$.*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A 278 (1974), 949–951.

[10] J-P Demailly: *Estimations L^2 pour l'opérateur $\bar\partial$ d'un fibré vectoriel holomorphe semi-positif au-dessus d'une variété kählérienne complète*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) **15** (1982), 457–511.

[11] J-P Demailly: *Complex Analytic and Differential Geometry*, Monograph Grenoble (1997).

[12] A. Dickenstein & C. Sessa: *Canonical representatives in moderate cohomology*, Invent. Math. **80** (1985), 417–434..

[13] P. Fuhrmann: *On the corona theorem and its application to spectral problems in Hilbert spaces*, Trans. AMS **132** (1968), 55-66.

[14] J. Hergoualch: *Le probleme de la couronne*, Memoire Bordeaux (2001) *Autour du problème de la couronne* Thesis Bordeaux (2004).

[15] M. Hickel: *Solution d'une conjecture de C. Berenstein-A. Yger et invariants de contact à l'infini*, Ann. Inst. Fourier **51** (2001), 707–744.

[16] J. Kollár: *Sharp effective Nullstellensatz*, J. American Math. Soc. **1** (1988), 963–975.

[17] F.S. Macaulay: *The algebraic theory of modular systems*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge 1916.

[18] M. Nöther: *Über einen Satz aus der Theorie der algebraischen Functionen*, Math. Ann. (1873), 351–359.

[19] M. Passare: *Residues, currents, and their relation to ideals of holomorphic functions*, Math. Scand. **62** (1988), 75–152.
[20] M. Passare & A. Tsikh & A. Yger: *Residue currents of the Bochner-Martinelli type*, Publ. Mat. **44** (2000), 85-117.
[21] H. Skoda: *Application des techniques L^2 à la théorie des idéaux d'une algèbre de fonctions holomorphes avec poids*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. **5** (1972), 545–579.
[22] H. Skoda: *Morphismes surjectifs de fibrés vectoriels semi-positifs*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. **11** (1978), 577–611.

Department of Mathematics, Chalmers University of Technology and the University of Göteborg, S-412 96 GÖTEBORG, SWEDEN
E-mail address: matsa@math.chalmers.se